

Action/Consent Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

A Review of California's Cross-Enrollment Program

The Commission will review a final report regarding the state's Cross-Enrollment Program. The report provides a history of this program since its inception in 1994, an analysis of institutional and student participation in the program, and the following recommendations:

- ♦ The Commission recommends that the Cross Enrollment Program be continued.
- ♦ The Commission recommends that the University, State University, and community college campuses improve the manner by which students are informed of the availability of courses at other colleges through the Cross Enrollment Program. To do so, the Commission recommends that counseling offices and transfer centers at community colleges should encourage potential transfer students to utilize the Cross Enrollment Program. In particular, the Cross-Enrollment Program should be an integral part of existing transfer articulation agreements and programs between two-year and four-year institutions.
- ♦ The Commission recommends that the current \$10 fee a student pays to enroll in the program is appropriate and should be continued.

The report will be transmitted to the Governor and Legislature once the Commission adopts it.

Recommended Action: Commission approval of the report for appropriate transmittal.

Presenter: Murray J. Haberman.



A Review of California's Cross-Enrollment Program

Legislation In 1994, SB 1914 (Killea) created a Cross-Enrollment Program. The program permits any student who is enrolled at least half-time in any campus of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, or the University of California to enroll at another system's campus, without formal admission and on a space available basis. Students pay an administrative fee of no more than \$10, and may enroll in no more than one course per academic term. Student admittance to courses is at the discretion of authorities at both the sending and receiving colleges, and the program is limited to public colleges and universities.

To determine the effectiveness of the Cross Enrollment Program, the Legislature directed each of the three public segments to evaluate the impact of the program on student use, revenue implications, and other issues that may be identified to determine the program's efficiency, and to determine whether the program should be established permanently. Each segment was directed to report results of its evaluation to the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The Commission was asked to prepare a report based on the results of each segment's evaluation. Follow-up legislation, SB361, extended the Commission's reporting deadline, and directed the Commission to determine whether the program might be underutilized and to provide options for increasing student participation in the program. A copy of SB 1914 and SB 361 appear as Appendix A and B.

Background The initial impetus for the program was for the three public segments of higher education in California to become more accessible and responsive to student needs, to make cross-enrollment procedures simpler and less time consuming, and to begin to develop a new "learner-centered" model of a college or university for the 21st century. It was thought that cross-enrollment would also maximize the utilization of educational resources by filling empty classroom seats in each of the three public segments of higher education. The program could also expand opportunities for potential transfer students by providing them with the opportunity to enroll in classes that may not be offered by their home campus, and to explore new academic programs and institutions.

Several objectives of the program were stated in the initial legislation that established the program, and included:

- ♦ Enabling campuses of the three public segments of higher education to become more accessible, to become more responsive to student

needs and to make cross-enrollment procedures simpler and less time consuming.

- ♦ Expanding existing practices related to concurrent enrollment and to expand opportunities for potential transfer students to participate in activities that familiarize them with a university campus.
- ♦ Responding to legislative and postsecondary institutional interest in sharing resources, increasing ease of access, and encouraging intersegmental cooperation.
- ♦ Moving toward achieving a seamless transition of students between the higher education systems and to potentially increase transfers from the California Community Colleges to the California State University and the University of California by encouraging students to continue their education beyond the certificate or associate degree level.

This report, in response to legislative directive, evaluates those objectives.

**Establishing an
advisory
committee to the
Commission's
study**

The Commission established an advisory committee to assist it in preparing its analysis of the Cross-Enrollment Program. The committee was comprised of representatives from each of the three public segments, along with Commission staff. The committee included: Aiden Ely of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Judy Osman of the California State University Chancellor's Office, and Annik Hirshen of the University of California Office of the President. The Commission wishes to acknowledge these three representatives for their assistance in preparing reports and for providing advice to Commission staff.

The committee met twice and discussed: (1) previous reports prepared by the segments that assessed the Cross-Enrollment Program; (2) issues to be addressed in the Commission's report; (3) the availability of data to support a study; and (4) the development of a common data collection tool. It was clear from conversations at these meetings that no central depository of information on the Cross-Enrollment Program existed, and that little data was available from individual campuses. In order to respond to the Commission's request for information, each systemwide office representative agreed to conduct a special survey of their respective campuses using a common survey instrument. This survey asked each campus to report specific information on their participation in the program, along with the extent to which students at their campuses were cross-enrolled.

**A cautionary note
regarding the data
collected**

The data collected and provided to the Commission by the systemwide offices regarding campus and student participation in the Cross-Enrollment Program was limited, inconsistent and incomplete. There was no systematic, systemwide method for collecting data and most campuses do not maintain a specific database attributed to cross-enrolled students.

In many cases, campuses were required to manually compile information regarding student participation by hand. Campus participation in the program is voluntary, and individual campuses maintain their own data, unique to their institution, regarding student participation in the program. Because of the manner by which data are maintained, it is important to note that the data reported to the Commission for this study shows no correlation between the numbers of participants reported by the different systemwide offices. The lack of consistency can be attributed to the fact that not all colleges responded to the systemwide survey, campus databases may not capture all students, and some campuses may not be reporting attendance of students from other segments who are participating in this program. Therefore, it is not possible to reach any definitive conclusions regarding the effectiveness or utilization of this program.

**Campus
participation in
the program**

California Community Colleges

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office surveyed 108 colleges; 83 campuses responded. Of those responding, 37 reported that they participated in the Cross-Enrollment Program. This was more than double the number of community colleges that participated in 1996. Student participation in the program varied by campus. Three community colleges reported that they only sent cross-enrollment students, but did not receive any. A list of community colleges that participate in the program appears in Appendix C.

Of the 37 colleges that participated in the program, the admissions and records office administered the program 65 percent of the time, followed by the transfer center (35%), the counseling office (16%), and the career center (8%). The Transfer and Articulation program within the Student Services and Special Programs Division of the Chancellor's Office has oversight responsibility for the Cross-Enrollment Program at the state level.

Of the 83 colleges that responded to the Chancellor's Office survey, 46 indicated that they did not participate in the program. The most prevalent reasons cited for not participating included: the inability to count students for apportionment; a lack of resources to support program management; a lack resources to support MIS student tracking/record keeping; and that the community college campus was regionally isolated from a four-year institution. Other community colleges chose not to participate for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to: a university unable or unwilling to participate; a lack of student interest; or it was against district policy.

Those community colleges that participated in the Cross Enrollment Program used a variety of methods to advertise it. Most common among these approaches was the use of counselors, transfer center staff, registrars and admission officers, the college catalog, and brochures. Information about the program was also disseminated via class schedules, flyers,

college websites, educational advisors, university representatives, mailings, admission marquee, advertisements, transfer planning guides, and by word of mouth.

California State University

The Chancellor's Office of the California State University surveyed 23 of its colleges. Although all campuses support the program, some campuses have few or no participants, in large part because local community colleges did not participate. However, it is important to note that many State University campuses have developed strong transfer agreements with community colleges in place of or in addition to the Cross-Enrollment Program. In addition, other transfer programs have been initiated between the State University and community colleges. For example, community college and State University representatives have drafted guidelines for implementation of the 4CSU Program. That program assists students who choose to begin their postsecondary career at a California Community College and who have a baccalaureate degree as their goal. The program identifies the academic services that students are entitled to at each segment. Cross-enrollment can be an integral part of transfer agreements.

University of California

All nine University of California campuses participate in the Cross-Enrollment Program. UC Berkeley and UC Riverside have a lower overall number of participants than the other campuses. UC Berkeley noted that it also participates in the Regional Association of East Bay Cross Registration and Concurrent Enrollment Programs (RAEBCU), which were established prior to the Cross-Enrollment Program. The campus indicated that the low number of participants in the Cross-Enrollment Program might be due to the relatively high number of students participating in RAEBCU.

At a majority of the campuses, the Cross-Enrollment Program is administered through the Admissions and Registration Office. At UC Irvine and UC Los Angeles, however, the Extension Office administers the incoming students, while the Registrar's Office administers the outgoing students.

UC campuses use a wide range of methods to communicate information about the program to students. All of the campuses but one indicated that they use the college catalog as the primary forum for communicating information about the program. In addition to the catalog, all but one of the campuses used additional methods for informing students, including counselors, the registrar, the admission office, the extension office, transfer centers, class schedules, websites, and brochures.

The University of California Office of the President noted that while these forms of communication have been moderately successful, a num-

ber of its campuses provided several recommendations for increasing the utilization of the program. One campus suggested that a website should be developed and dedicated to answering students and staff's frequently asked questions about the program. Another campus suggested that transfer centers encourage more students to take advantage of the program before becoming students at the University. A third campus suggested an advertising campaign to University students, as they appear to underutilize the program. Finally, one campus observed that there have been few queries from community colleges about the program and as a result the campus has had few students from the local community colleges to participate.

**Student
participation in
the program**

California Community Colleges

According to the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the extent of record keeping among community colleges participating in cross-enrollment varies. This may be a symptom of problems cited as reasons for not participating at all i.e. "lack of resources to support program management" and "lack of resources to support MIS student tracking/record keeping." Display 1 indicates that of the 83 colleges reporting, 37 colleges participated in the Cross-Enrollment Program. The number of community colleges reporting data for students sent to the California State University and the University of California from 1997 to 2002 ranged from 12 to 30.

<i>DISPLAY 1 Estimated Number of California Community College Students Attending California State University or University of California Campuses</i>				
Year	Attending CSUs	Attending UCs	Number of Community Colleges Reporting Participating	
			CSU	UC
1997-98	62	22	7	5
1998-99	72	20	7	3
1999-00	114	34	10	6
2000-01	260	61	16	10
2001-02	493	84	18	12
Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.				

Conversely, Display 2 shows that the number of community colleges reporting students received from State University and the University over the same period ranged from 1 to 7.

DISPLAY 2 Estimated Number of California State University and University of California Students Attending California Community College Campuses

Year	CSUs Students	UCs Students	Number of Community Colleges Reporting Participating	
			CSU	UC
1997-98	12	0	1	0
1998-99	8	0	2	0
1999-00	17	0	2	0
2000-01	26	5	3	3
2001-02	20	10	4	3

Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

In its report to the Commission, the Chancellor's Office noted that the general pattern over the five-year period for students sent to state university and university suggests an increase in the number of community colleges gathering data and an increase in the number of students participating in the program. Such trends are less apparent regarding students coming to the community colleges from state university and university campuses. Given the limited number of community colleges reporting data, it is possible that the actual number of students participating in the Cross-Enrollment Program is higher than reported.

Data collection regarding courses taken by cross-enrolled students is very limited in the community college system. Appendix D displays a list of courses reported by community colleges as having been taken by cross-enrolled students.

California State University

In its report to the Commission, the Chancellor's Office of California State University reported that 404 California Community College students and 42 University of California students enrolled in a state university course under the Cross-Enrollment Program in 2001-02 (Display 3). During that same year, campuses reported that 24 state university students took a course at a community college and 22 state university students took a course at a University of California campus (Display 4).

DISPLAY 3 Estimated Number of California State University Students Attending California Community College or University of California Campuses

Year	Attending CCCs	Attending UCs	Number of Participating CCC and UC Campuses
1997-98	1	2	1
1998-99	8	1	2
1999-00	15	5	2
2000-01	14	3	3
2001-02	24	22	4

Source: Chancellor's Office of the California State University.

DISPLAY 4 Estimated Number of California Community College and University of California Students Attending California State University Campuses

Year	CCCs Students	UCs Students	Number of Participating CSU Campuses
1997-98	88	0	4
1998-99	110	3	4
1999-00	121	20	5
2000-01	156	21	6
2001-02	404	42	15

Source: Chancellor's Office of the California State University.

Some campuses provided anecdotes to the data they submitted. The State University Chancellor's Office explains that in some cases, campuses have established consortia with feeder colleges for specific majors in which a two-year college was unable to provide courses. In fact, one campus indicated that a consortium with a feeder campus would continue even if the cross-enrollment program sunsets.

State University campuses could not fully respond to the Commission's request for information because student information record systems used by state university campuses do not capture and store cross-enrollment information. Therefore, information provided by campuses is either an estimate or based on copies of forms that campuses maintained. Administrators of the State University Chancellor's Office believe that the numbers provided by the colleges are conservative and that the actual number of students served by the program exceeds the number reported by its campuses. The figures provided do not include the number of students who participate in collaborative enrollment programs that preceded the establishment of the Cross-Enrollment Program.

University of California

In its survey of its campuses, the University of California Office of the President found that for the two-year period of 2000-2002, an estimated 1011 students participated in the Cross-Enrollment Program, either as University students attending other segments or as students from other segments attending the University. (It is important to note that historical data reported for the University involvement in the program was for a combined two-year period.) The majority of students who participated in the program came from other segments to the University to take classes.

For the five-year period of 1994-1999, the Office of the President reported that an estimated 854 students participated in the program. Display 5 shows that in comparing the University data for that initial five-year period to that for the 2000-02 period, the participation of students from other segments taking classes at the University rose most at UC Los Angeles, UC San Diego, and UC Santa Cruz. This increase may be due to

the fact the program is now established on those campuses with a history of students successfully participating.

According to the Office of the President, of the 1011 participants in 2000-2002, an estimated 949, or 94%, were students enrolled in the other segments coming to the University to take classes. The other estimated 62 students, or 6%, were University students who took classes at one of the other segments. The latter number may be lower than the actual number of University students who took advantage of the program, as some of the campuses did not track the students who took classes elsewhere. Overall, the percentage of incoming students rose slightly since the 1994-1999 period, which indicated that 91% of the total participants were students enrolled in other segments coming to take classes at the University.

DISPLAY 5 Intersegmental Cross Enrollment Program at the University of California, 2000-2002

Estimated Number of University of California Students Attending California Community College or California State University Campuses				Estimated Number of California Community College and California State University Students Attending the University of California Campuses		
	Attending CCCs	Attending CSUs	Total	CCCs Students	CSUs Students	Total
Berkeley			0	4	0	4
Davis	0	22	22	1	0	1
Irvine	0	13	13	38	6	44
Los Angeles			0	n/a	n/a	182 ¹
Riverside			0	4	0	4
San Diego	n/a	n/a	n/a ²	n/a	n/a	196 ¹
San Francisco			0			0
Santa Barbara	n/a	n/a	n/a ²	n/a	n/a	313 ^{1,3}
Santa Cruz	n/a	n/a	27 ¹	202	3	205
<i>Grand Total</i>			62			949
1. The campus provided overall numbers, but did not track the CC or CSU breakdown. 2. The campus did not track UC students enrolled elsewhere. 3. The campus tracking occurred from Winter 2000 through Spring 2002.						
Source: University of California Office of the President.						

The Office of the President also estimated that of 949 students who took classes at UC during 2000-2002 period, at least 249 came from the community college system. It is thought that this number may actually be higher, as some campuses, such as UC Los Angeles and UC San Diego, did not track the home segment of participating students. In addition, UC Santa Barbara indicated that, while the campus did not track the enrolled students' home segment, a majority of the 313 students who took classes at the campus were community college students.

Courses taken by students participating in the program varied widely, and are presented in a table in Appendix E. Of particular note, UCLA reported that military science classes have had the greatest enrollment by both community college and State University students. In fact, that campus estimated that half of the inbound students to its institution are enrolled in ROTC, which is an interesting outcome of the program.

The Commission requested that each Systemwide Office query their respective colleges to make recommendations as to what steps might be taken in order to increase utilization or to improve the Cross-Enrollment Program. The following paragraphs are abstracted from each segment's response.

Policy issues for consideration

California Community Colleges

The Chancellor's Office reported that the vast majority of responses dealing with improving the program had to do with some aspect of improved marketing. Beyond that general recommendation, suggestions included development of a comprehensive brochure, more collaboration among the segments, transfer representative visits to classes, and coordination with State University and University outreach efforts. Thirty-one community colleges of those surveyed responded that the program should be continued in its present form. Twelve colleges recommended continuing program if full FTES funding was offered. Twenty-four colleges recommended the elimination of the program.

Generally, the California Community Colleges support the intent and objectives of the Cross-Enrollment Program. Objectives such as increasing access, responding to student need, maximizing utilization of resources, simplifying processes, and encouraging intersegmental cooperation remain a high priority for the community college system. Without question the program has responded to the needs of some students by providing access to courses not available on their home campus and the opportunity to experience new academic programs or institutions. Participation has increased over the past six years both in terms of the number of community colleges and the number of students participating.

However when considering the questions regarding underutilization and effectiveness, the Chancellor's Office of the community colleges noted several factors that have significant implications for the future of the Cross-Enrollment Program. Those factors include:

- ♦ **Geographic distance.** Despite a desire to participate, geographic distance between institutions serves as a barrier to participation in cross-enrollment for some community colleges. Traditionally a problem for rural colleges, geographic distance may also affect students who try to enroll in certain campuses and/or courses that are impacted. Distance education may alleviate this problem, but this approach raises its own policy considerations.

- ♦ **Capacity.** Current utilization and attempts for expansion of cross-enrollment will continue to be frustrated by issues rising from capacity limits in all three segments. Over enrollment at the system level and the increasing number of impacted campuses, majors and high demand courses provide less opportunity for students to cross-enroll on a “space available basis”. Complexity, inconvenience and in some instances rejection stemming from capacity limits is a frustrating experience, and increased marketing of cross-enrollment may only serve to increase the severity of the problem.
- ♦ **Lack of resources.** Lack of funding to provide for the cost of instruction, management and administration of the Cross-Enrollment Program continues to be cited by community colleges as a significant barrier to participation. In an environment in which financial resources are not keeping pace with the cost of increasing enrollments, the lack of sufficient funding for existing programs and services often requires colleges to make difficult decisions regarding priorities. While the current \$10 fee may be cost effective from the student perspective, it does little to offset the real cost of instruction, program management, and administration. The lack of full ADA or FTE funding for cross-enrolled students serves as a disincentive to continue the program.
- ♦ **Lack of data on Transfer and Cross-enrollment.** The Cross-Enrollment Program encompasses many elements that would seem to encourage and support the transfer of students from community colleges to four-year institutions. One would expect that strategies such as collaboration between colleges, enrollment in courses that are unavailable on a community college campus or the exploration of other academic programs and institutions would result in an increase in the number of students that transfer. However, research indicates that many variables effect transfer numbers and rates, no specific data have been gathered that directly relate cross-enrollment to increases in transfer. Cross-enrollment may in fact result in transfer increases, at least in some instances, however community college have no direct evidence to support such a causal relationship. Therefore, the effectiveness of cross-enrollment in terms of increasing transfer cannot be established. Impacted courses and campuses as well as higher admissions standards resulting from capacity limits are most likely to have the greatest impact on transfer to California State University and University of California campuses in the future.

The Chancellor’s Office noted that factors related to geographic distance, capacity and resources might limit the utilization and effectiveness of the Cross-Enrollment Program. On the other hand survey results suggest that participation by community colleges and students is increasing. As long as student needs are being met and educational institutions are willing to participate there would seem to be no reason to discontinue the program.

To address those factors outlined above, the Chancellor's Office suggested several modifications to the program if the Cross-Enrollment Program is to be continued:

- ♦ Allow campuses to report enrollment for budget purposes or to collect appropriate fees associated with instruction and program management;
- ♦ Allow students to register based on the same criteria as native students rather than "on a space available basis";
- ♦ Link the Cross-Enrollment Program directly to emerging dual admission programs i.e. 4CSU and UC Dual Admissions;
- ♦ Establish a coordinated marketing effort among the three segments of higher education; and
- ♦ Establish an evaluation component that defines and accurately measures variables for program utilization and effectiveness.

California State University

The California State University Chancellor's Office made similar arguments regarding the program's utilization. It noted that the program is appropriately used as long as student objectives are served and educational resources are effectively utilized. Its report indicated that students might enroll in courses that were not available at the home campus, enroll in courses that were more conveniently located or scheduled, and/or take part in a unique experience offered by another segment of California public higher education.

The State University conducted no cost analysis for the program. The Chancellor's Office noted in its report to the Commission, however, that its campuses participate voluntarily, and that many campuses have absorbed administrative costs associated with the relatively few number of students they enroll. At least one college determined that it is more cost effective to allow student participation without any administrative fee.

The Chancellor's Office suggested that the program should be modified to allow campuses to collect appropriate instructional funding and to allow students to have easier access than is currently provided by program restrictions. It also noted that the viability of the program may be limited due to enrollment growth at some campuses, and as fiscal resources might become more constrained.

The Chancellor's Office suggested the following modifications to the program that might increase student participation:

- ♦ Allow campuses to report enrollment for budget purposes or to collect appropriate student fees associated with the cost of instruction; and

- ♦ Increase the ability of students to register, without waiting to register on a space available basis, after the enrollment period has been completed.

University of California

The University of California Office of the President (UCOP) also suggested several modifications to the program. UCOP supports continuing the program, but recommended the following:

- ♦ Increase the \$10 administrative fee to \$25. Many of the University campuses indicated support for the extension of the program, but noted that an increase in the fee would be a necessary change. UC Los Angeles noted that it costs \$25 to enroll a student, and subsequently maintain that student's academic record in perpetuity.
- ♦ Improve the reciprocal nature of the program. For example, UC Santa Cruz noted that the number of students that the campus receives is high, while the number of students going from that campus to other segments is low, because many of the local community college campuses do not participate. The overall numbers reflect that this unequal use occurs at a majority of University campuses. The UCOP recommended examining whether the other segments can increase their role in the program, in order to make cross-enrollment more equitable.
- ♦ Intended students may not always use the program. For example, at UC Santa Barbara, a number of students took advantage of the program as an opportunity to finish courses at a lower cost. There is nothing to prevent a former University student from enrolling at a community college to take a course through the program to finish a degree. UCOP noted that this clearly was not the intent of the program. As a result of such unintended uses, UC suggested two additional requirements be added for those students who chose to participate: 1) limit program participation eligibility to a specific number of terms; and 2) prohibit students who have already completed a graded academic term at one segment from taking part in the program at that segment. These prohibitions would prevent a UCLA senior, for example, from enrolling at a local community college to take her remaining units at UCLA for the \$10 fee.

The University indicated in its report that the program may have a number of valuable intended uses, including the improvement of articulation and transfer. The University also noted that it views cross-enrollment as a beneficial way for prospective students attending another segment to “try-out” the University to evaluate whether they want to pursue transferring. However, UCOP wrote that, “without an in-depth study that includes interviewing prospective transfer students, it is hard to predict what impact the program has had on students’ decisions or whether they had already decided to transfer when they enroll in the program.”

**Commission
findings**

It is clear to the Commission that a full assessment of the effectiveness and utilization of the Cross-Enrollment Program cannot be completed based on the information currently available. Since there is no state cost associated with the program and there are some students benefitting from having the program available, there is merit in continuing this program as one method for encouraging intersegmental cooperation and providing additional educational opportunities for students.

Based on the reports and information provided by systemwide offices of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California, the Commission expresses the following findings and recommendations.

1. Student participation in the program is very low

Less than 1000 students statewide participate in the Cross Enrollment Program out of a total number of 2.65 million students enrolled at the University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges combined each year. This represents less than 0.04% of all students who could utilize the program.

There are a number of reasons for low participation in the program. Students might not be fully informed about the availability and benefits of the program; campuses may not be geographically accessible; colleges may choose not to participate because they do not receive funding; and University, State University, and community college campuses may have initiated other programs to assist community college students in transferring to four-year colleges, and have chosen not to make the Cross-Enrollment Program part of those efforts.

2. There is some benefit to the students who participate in the program

The students taking advantage of this program do reap some of the benefits envisioned when this program was initiated. They are able to take classes at another institution at minimal cost. They can take courses that are unavailable at their primary campus. Some community college students who participate in the program may be more likely to transfer to four-year institutions.

3. There is no state cost associated with this program. The current \$10 administrative fee is appropriate.

Colleges have little incentive to promote a program that precludes them from earning state revenue for those students they enroll. The issues raised by the segments regarding funding for this program are legitimate. More community colleges might participate in the program if they were to receive full funding for cross-enrolled students. However, this was not the intent behind the enabling legislation. In light of the fact that a resi-

dent student can matriculate for only \$11 a unit, the college might encourage students enrolled at four-year institutions to enroll as regular community college student so that the college can receive ADA/FTE revenue for those students enrolled.

Increasing the fee beyond the current \$10 limitation to \$25 as suggested by the University of California would have a minimal impact on reducing a campus's expenditures necessary to support the program. There is no evidence to suggest that increasing the fee would encourage more campuses to participate. However, any increase might discourage some students to cross-enroll.

4. The Commission acknowledges that several initiatives, in addition to the Cross Enrollment Program, are currently underway throughout the state that are designed to improve cooperation and collaboration among the State's segments of higher education.

The Commission supports programs that encourage greater educational opportunity for students to move among and between the State's segments of higher education. While the Cross-Enrollment Program is one such vehicle, other cooperative programs such as 4CSU and Dual Admission also offer students opportunities to expand their education. The Commission encourages the University of California, California State University, and the California Community Colleges to implement such cooperative and collaborative programs in a manner that will most effectively meet the needs of students who desire to enroll concurrently in more than one system of higher education.

**Commission
recommendations**

- 1. The Commission recommends that the Cross Enrollment Program be continued.**
 - 2. The Commission recommends that the University, State University, and community college campuses improve the manner by which students are informed of the availability of courses at other colleges through the Cross Enrollment Program. To do so, the Commission recommends that counseling offices and transfer centers at community colleges should encourage potential transfer students to utilize the Cross Enrollment Program. In particular, the Cross-Enrollment Program should be an integral part of existing transfer articulation agreements and programs between two-year and four-year institutions.**
 - 3. The Commission recommends that the current \$10 fee a student pays to enroll in the program is appropriate and should be continued.**
-